



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

| | | | | |
|------------|------------|-------------------|--------|------|
| 09/944,118 | 09/04/2001 | Takaharu Hutamura | 11-058 | 1726 |
|------------|------------|-------------------|--------|------|

23400 7590 09/28/2004

POSZ & BETHARDS, PLC
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE
SUITE 10
RESTON, VA 20190

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NGUYEN, DANNY

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2836

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Advisory Action | Application No. 09/944,118 | Applicant(s) HUTAMURA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Danny Nguyen | Art Unit 2836 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see the attachment.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-26.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: none.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. Other: _____


BRIAN SIRCUS
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant argued that Eto discloses the high side transistor and the low side transistor are on all times. Examiner disagrees with the arguments. Eto does teach that the voltage detector (30, 3a, 4a, 5a) detects the output voltage the output terminal (Node N22), when the level of the output voltage becomes lower than the reference, the detector allows the low side transistor (22b) to turn off, and the high side transistor turns on (22a), in contrast, when the output voltage exceeds the reference voltage, the voltage detector allows the high side transistor to turn off, the low side transistor is on (col. 17 and 18, lines 8-22).

Thus, the high side transistor (22a) and the low side transistor (22b) are on one at a time. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6 and 11 do not overcome the Eto reference.

2. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., both transistors maintain off state, see Remark on page 2) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

3. In response to applicant's argument that Eto is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24

Art Unit: 2836

USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Eto discloses a protect circuit (such as shown in figure 12) that is directed to an over-voltage and under-voltage protection which are applicable to all protection circuits, and APA discloses the switching element (4 shown in the prior art figure 10). This is a well-known feature provides improvement to the switching function that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized would benefit to all protection circuits.